

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Official Action of February 9, 2006. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections. Further, Applicants believe that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserves the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

As a preliminary matter, claims 6, 8 and 10 have been amended in order to correct typos. No new matter has been added.

I. Claim for Priority

It is noted with appreciation that the Office Action has acknowledged receipt of the claim for priority and the certified document supporting that claim.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing an initialed copy of form PTO-1449, which was submitted on January 7, 2004 by the Applicants.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Toshiichi et al. (JP 2001-094336). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least reasons discussed below.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to an antenna with built-in filter comprising: a laminated dielectric block that is formed such that dielectric sheets each having a conductive film formed on one surface are laminated so as to constitute at least one filter; a radiation element fixedly provided at the laminated dielectric block and electrically connected to one electrode of the filter; and a feeding terminal electrode that is provided on a mounting face of the dielectric block, and opposes to a circuit board when the laminated dielectric block is mounted on the circuit board; wherein the feeding terminal electrode and the other electrode of the filter are electrically connected by at least one connecting wiring provided on one or more dielectric sheets, and two or more via-contacts each of which is composed of a conductor embedded into a contact hole formed in at least one of the one or more dielectric sheets, wherein the at least one connecting wiring and the two or more via-contacts are not exposed to an outer face of the laminated dielectric block, and wherein the two via-contacts are formed at places that are different from each other on a plane view of the dielectric block.

Toshiichi et al. arguably teaches fabrication of an antenna with built-in filter. However, none of the applied art, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 as amended.

Specifically, none of the applied art, alone or in combination, does not disclose, teach or suggest that “the feeding terminal electrode and the other electrode of the filter are electrically connected by at least one connecting wiring provided on one or more dielectric sheets, and two or more via-contacts each of which is composed of a conductor embedded into a contact hole formed in at least one of the one or more dielectric sheets, wherein the at least one connecting wiring and the two or more via-contacts are not exposed to an outer face of the laminated dielectric block, and wherein the two via-contacts are formed at places that are different from each other on a plane view of the dielectric block.”

Thus, the applied art does not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled by the foregoing amendments. Therefore, the rejection of the claims are now moot. withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claims 4-8 and 10

As a preliminary matter, by the foregoing amendment, claim 4 has been amended so as to depend on claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that since claims 1-8 and 10 depend on claim 1, they are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable respectively and they are further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Toshiichi et al. in view of Arai et al. (US 6,542,050). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that since claim 9 depends on claim 1, it is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable and it is further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

V. Newly Added Claims

By the foregoing amendment, Applicants have added claims 11-13 in order to claim various features of the invention. Since they recite features similar to that of claim 1, they are allowable for at least same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned has been given limited recognition by the Director to prosecute as an attorney this application under 37 C.F.R. §10.9(a).

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. KWM-0015 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Toshikatsu Imaizumi

Registration No.: L0046 (Limited Recognition)
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorney for Applicants